



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ML

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,850	10/15/2003	Henri-Charles Deborde	790_019	8438
25191	7590	07/18/2007	EXAMINER	
BURR & BROWN PO BOX 7068 SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068			VANAMAN, FRANK BENNETT	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3618		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/18/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/685,850	DEBORDE ET AL.
	Examiner Frank Vanaman	Art Unit 3618

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frank Vanaman. (3) _____

(2) Tim Evans. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


7/13/07
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Initially, discussions concerned the use of the reference of Wolf to modify the base reference of Fagot et al., with applicant inquiring as to the motivation to combine Wolf, in that the shape relied upon in Wolf is taught in association with a traction member (e.g., 14) -- although applicant additionally noted that the member in Wolf may be a non-pliant material (see Wolf at col. 4, lines 17-19). Applicant further suggested that it may be desirable to amend the claims to include a limitation that the difference in thickness between the central and peripheral sections is substantial throughout the forward end, as a distinction with respect to Fagot et al., wherein it appears as though the difference in heights goes to zero, at least at a single point in the precise center of the ski. The examiner noted that while this may define beyond the combination of references currently applied, it may not render the claims allowable, in that at least the reference to Porte (FR 2,804,335, relied upon earlier) teaches that a difference in heights remains substantial throughout the front of a gliding device, although the Porte reference lacks a number of limitations now recited in the claims.